Study	Experimental			Control			Standardized Mean Difference	SMD	95%–CI	W(fixed)	W(random)
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD					
Group = Non–Remi											
Chia YY 2004	49	5.2	1.1	48	7.4	3.1		−0.94	[−1.36; −0.52]	25.7%	15.9%
Elokda 2015	40	15.0	6.5	40	24.1	11.0		−1.00	[−1.46; −0.53]	20.9%	15.7%
Ozturk 2008	20	47.0	8.0	20	55.0	9.0		−0.92	[−1.58; −0.27]	10.6%	14.5%
Fixed effect model	109			108				−0.96	[−1.24; −0.68]	57.3%	−−
Random effects model								−0.96	[−1.24; −0.68]	−−	46.1%
Heterogeneity: I–squared=0%, tau–squared=0, p=0.9776											
Group = Remi											
Celebi N 2014	30	152.0	95.0	30	304.0	247.0		−0.80	[−1.33; −0.27]	16.4%	15.3%
Gokce 2009	20	169.1	51.2	20	402.9	24.8		−5.70	[−7.15; −4.24]	2.2%	9.1%
Hwang WJ 2013	28	109.1	12.1	28	165.3	35.3		−2.10	[−2.76; −1.44]	10.4%	14.5%
Lee SJ 2010	30	36.3	11.2	30	54.2	13.0		−1.46	[−2.03; −0.88]	13.8%	15.0%
Fixed effect model	108			108				−1.58	[−1.90; −1.25]	42.7%	−−
Random effects model								−2.33	[−3.62; −1.03]	−−	53.9%
Heterogeneity: I–squared=92.8%, tau–squared=1.562, p<0.0001											
Fixed effect model	**217**			**216**				**−1.22**	**[−1.44; −1.01]**	**100%**	**−−**
Random effects model								**−1.60**	**[−2.25; −0.96]**	**−−**	**100%**
Heterogeneity: I–squared=87.9%, tau–squared=0.6292, p<0.0001											

−6 −4 −2 0 2 4 6
Favors Esmolol   Favors Control

Supplemental Figure 2. Stratified data evaluating the effect of intraoperative esmolol on postoperative opioid consumption comp